



CAC MEETING #2 SUMMARY

JUNE 6TH, 2018 – 1:00 – 2:30 PM
MEDFORD LIBRARY – 205 S CENTRAL AVE, MEDFORD, OR

SUMMARY

MEETING ATTENDEES

JURISDICTIONS/ORGANIZATIONS:

Janelle Wilson, Kori Ebenhack, Brad Earl, Karen Zerger, Jay Harland, Pamela Norr, Eric Leal, Ed Smith-Burns, Jim Herndon, Robin Lee, Michelle Glass, Patrick McKechnie, Francis Plowman, George Adams, Tom Fink, Kevin Keating, Natalie Richie, Jay Phillips

RVTD STAFF:

Paige West, Jon Sullivan, Julie Brown, Mary Wooding

CONSULTANT TEAM:

Susie Wright and Molly McCormick (Kittelson & Associates, Inc.), Ryan Farncomb (Jacobs)

DESIRED OUTCOMES

- ▶ CAC input on Vision Statement.
- ▶ CAC input on Goal Areas and potential weighting
- ▶ CAC understanding of the modeling tools
- ▶ CAC input on evaluation criteria

TIME	SUBJECT	LEAD PRESENTER	GUIDANCE REQUESTED
1:00	Welcome/Project Updates	Paige West/ RVTD	Confirm Understanding, Questions for Clarification
1:10	Vision and Goals	Susie Wright/ Kittelson	Comments on three proposed draft vision statements and identification of preferred vision statement Comments on six goal areas Input on potential weighting of the goal areas
1:45	Modeling Tools	Ryan Farncomb/ Jacobs	Confirm Understanding, Questions for Clarification
2:00	Evaluation Criteria	Susie	Comments on evaluation criteria by goal area
2:25	Next Steps/Adjourn	Susie	

MEETING NOTES

- ▶ Welcome/project updates
 - Very important milestone to help RVTD move forward with the planning process
 - Input from both TAC/CAC and the general public
 - Let us know if you need more of the virtual open house handouts

- ▶ Vision and goals
 - Vision Statement
 - Version 1 is getting to high quality and choice ridership
 - Version 2 is distinguished by thinking about the balance between frequency and access, emphasizing corridors with more ridership
 - Version 3 focuses on providing service to transit-dependent populations with adequate connections and access
 - Initial Vision statement voting

Version 1	Version 2	Version 3
7 votes	4 votes	3 votes

- Version 1 is preferred because...
 - More visionary, other ones sound like plans
 - Want to prioritize transit-dependent populations but the way to do that is by providing quality service and pulling people off the roads; making it seem viable by whole cross-section of community members
 - More general

- Includes businesses, housing, whole area better
- More visionary; it would be odd for the advisory group to send RVTD on a completely different track, as a community; we value transit; don't be as prescriptive in the vision statement
- More of a long-term vision; "realistic" takes into account the perception of residents and visitors; speaks to the quality of life
- Version 2 is preferred because...
 - Most used routes; provide reliable transit for ALL residents, whole valley; more precise; not just $\frac{3}{4}$ mile off main routes
 - The reality is that you need to consider balance; questions between density and frequency; for version 1, couldn't get past the word "realistic"; would like a mix of version 1 and version 2
 - Other versions are too wordy; vision statements start to be ignored if too long; frequency is important; ALL residents; to important destinations; would add the word "efficiently" before the word "provides"
 - Version 1 is too broad and too hopeful; to keep RVTD viable, need to think about the potentially diminishing pot of money; what can be sustained; more focus; if start specific, could enhance the vision later but if start too broad might not reach it and not focus our money
- Version 3 is preferred because...
 - For those with disabilities, might not be able to spend \$20 each way for a handicapped van; provide full service through cheaper RVTD services; extended service to 10 PM or midnight; more late-night employees can use transit and people with disabilities can work to help pay for their transportation
 - Needs to be short and concise but version 1 is a little too optimistic and hopeful
 - Stronger focus on accessibility as part of the vision of 2040; don't want some of those specifics to be lost along the way; also fan of version 1 but don't like the word "realistic"; maybe try to include "meet the diverse needs of our community"
- Didn't vote for one; would rather combine all into one; there are pieces in each one that are valuable; diversity is important
- How is a vision statement used and how often is it revisited in the future?
 - Sets the stage for this plan and for moving forward
 - You do want your vision statement to be visionary
 - The liked specificity in some of the vision statement versions could lend itself to more objectives
 - Recognizes the balance of different needs
- Don't make it too long because it will lose people's interest
- Realistic has to do with travel time and reliability
 - Not realistic for RVTD to pick me up at home and deliver me to work
- Idea of having to balance frequency and coverage

- Think that the best way to make an efficient use of funds needs to provide the best service on the arterials and concentrate the ridership; on the other hand, there are many residents outside of those arterials
- Stay firmly committed to increasing the efficiency of arterial service but always have our eye on the general demographics and ridership population
- New vote with potential word-smithing and after some discussion

Version 1	Version 2	Version 3
9 votes	6 votes	1 votes

- Vision statement should encourage staff and city to be excited to implement that vision
 - Employees need something bigger than their task at hand; understanding where the organization is going as a whole
- Quality of life verbiage in Version 1
 - We can achieve a lot more with choice ridership, such as decreasing VMT and GHG
 - But that doesn't mean mobility isn't important and providing independence for the transit-dependent is not important
 - RVTD was on track with a Version 1 type vision until 2009, but the recession made RVTD refocus to a Version 3 vision
 - Need to be responsive to the needs of the community
 - A vision is important but will sometimes have to be set aside
 - The Version 1 vision was pulled back to the core mission that is closer to Version 3
- Goals
 - Are there any important goals missing?
 - No response
 - Any questions about these goals or anything that seems lacking?
 - Define regional partners and stakeholders
 - Cities, county, ODOT, other transportation and land use agencies/bodies
 - Campuses, hospitals, major employers
 - All the goal areas seem interdependent; hard to weigh them against each other
 - Consider what does the system look like if you maximize one of these goals at the expense of the other goals
 - With the increase of population, the percentage of crime will increase and feeling safe on public transportation will need to be looked at
 - If people don't feel safe, they won't be getting on the bus
 - Not meeting the environment goal with all the empty buses going through cities currently
 - Community and coordination may work hand in hand

- Expanding cities with people needing to live their lives
- If don't have safety, no one will ride the bus

- ▶ Modeling tools
 - Not intended to be black boxes; they are tools that help with decision making
 - Provide a robust set of information to make decisions
 - Placetypes
 - Remix
 - Very efficient and quick overview of potential changes
 - Potential costs
 - JEMnR
 - Full system effects
 - Will look at packages of projects, not individual projects
 - TBEST
 - RVTD's tool
 - Process
 - This is the first process of this kind that has happened in the nation
 - The mix of all the models to get the best of all worlds
 - Questions
 - Transit-supportive areas; all regions are getting ready to expand their UGB; so density based on what year?
 - Ultimate horizon year of 2042
 - 2027 and 2037 in between as well
 - Using the MPO's model for land use assumptions
 - Some black box quality but we will calibrate as necessary
 - The models are adaptable and can be re-run if results do not make sense
 - Won't be focused on the exact numbers and forecasting; looking for impacts on a larger scale
 - The tools are inter-operable and can test results against each other to check that they are making sense
 - Will account for future zoning, future desired intensities of housing, etc.
 - Data that comes from the cities' comprehensive plans
 - Not sure how much time to spend with Place Type model with the size of the tracts
 - JEMnR and TBEST seems like the more exciting and valuable tools
 - A better resolution for what we are looking at
 - Percentage of accuracy
 - Nearer term is more accurate; as you go further into the future, it is hard to know for sure what will occur with land use and policy
 - TBEST has been calibrated by RVTD using 2012 data
 - Uses existing ridership as validation and can therefore be fairly accurate

- But new routes can't rely on current ridership numbers as a calibration tool
 - Can review them at an order of magnitude that is reasonable; to the exact number of riders would not be accurate (precise but not accurate)
 - Reminder that this is a living document that will continue to be updated every 10 years to help recalibrate and continue to plan near, mid, and long-term
 - It helps RVTD find funding and to prioritize projects as things change
 - With the amount of expansion going on recently, does RVTD know about all the new development?
 - Paige completes reviews for development in cities
 - Want to understand the differences between the forecast in each school district for growth
 - Maybe have a meeting between different cities so everyone is starting from the same point
- ▶ Evaluation criteria
 - CAC highest: goals 3 and 5
- ▶ Next steps
 - The CAC will meet again in September